

***RESULTS REVIEW AND RESOURCE REQUEST
FY 2001***

**The Asia/Near East Bureau's
FORWARD PROJECT
*FOSTERING RESOLUTION OF WATER RESOURCE DISPUTES***

The attached results information is from the FY 2001 Results Review and Resource Request (R4) for the ANE Bureau's *FORWARD* Project, and was assembled and analyzed by USAID/W/ANE/SEA.

March 1999

Please Note:

The attached FY 2001 Results Review and Resource Request ("R4") was assembled and analyzed by the country or USAID operating unit identified on this cover page.

The R4 is a "pre-decisional" USAID document and does not reflect results stemming from formal USAID review(s) of this document.

Related document information can be obtained from:

USAID Development Experience Clearinghouse
1611 N. Kent Street, Suite 200
Arlington, VA 22209-2111
Telephone: 703/351-4006 Ext. 106
Fax: 703/351-4039
Email: docorder@dec.cdie.org
Internet: <http://www.dec.org>

Released on or after Oct. 1, 2001

***"An army perishes if it has no equipment, it perishes if it has no food,
and it perishes if it has no money."***

Sun Tzu
The Art of War

Results Review and Resource Request The ANE Bureau's *FORWARD* Project FY 2001

Table of Contents

Cover Sheet
Quotation from Sun Tzu
Table of Contents

- 1.0 PART I: OVERVIEW AND FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE
- 2.0 PART II: RESULTS REVIEW
- 3.0 PART III: RESOURCE REQUEST
- 4.0 PART IV: WORKFORCE AND OE

Supplemental Annexes

- Annex 1. Environmental Impact
- Annex 2. Updated Results Framework
- Annex 3. Threshold Analysis (under separate cover)

List of Tables

- Table 1. Performance Data Tables
 - 1a. Number of Agreements on Track
 - 1b. Number of Agreements Reached
 - 1c. Overseas Funding of the Project
 - 1d. Host Country Requests for Assistance
- Table 2. Budget Request by Program/Country
 - 2a. FY 1999
 - 2b. FY 2000
 - 2c. FY 2001
- Table 3. Global Bureau Field Support Table
- Table 4. Workforce Table
- Table 5. AID/W OE Budget Table

List of Figures

- Figure 1. FORWARD Results Framework.

Results Review and Resource Request The ANE Bureau's *FORWARD* Project FY 2001

1.0 PART I: OVERVIEW AND FACTORS AFFECTING PROGRAM PERFORMANCE

Overview. The environmental water wars that raged across the western US in the 1970s and 1980s spawned a small, highly specialized industry of environmental dispute resolution professionals. Encouraged by their success, the ANE Bureau designed an experimental project to apply the lessons learned from US experience to water resource disputes in the Middle East. *FORWARD* was authorized in 1994 at a total life of project (LOP) funding level of \$15.2 million (including \$6.0 million in mission buy-ins), and after protracted delays in contracting the project formally came on line in July 1996.

Both the design and implementation contract for *FORWARD* call for proactive involvement in water disputes, through, *inter alia*, the provision of technical assistance and training of local specialists in collaborative problem-solving and dispute resolution. The project has generated widespread interest from the legal and academic communities, but more importantly--and more germane in attesting to the relevance of this strategic support objective (SSO) to higher-level Agency goals and objectives--it quickly developed support from the Agency's principal field missions in the Middle East. *FORWARD* now has field programs in:

- **Egypt:** \$0.86 million for decentralization and private sector participation in the water sector.
- **Jordan:** \$2.47 million for water services costing and tariff restructuring.
- **West Bank/Gaza:** \$1.35 million for aquifer and integrated water resources management.
- **Lebanon:** Seed-level funding for water system management in the Bekaa Valley.
- **Morocco:** Seed-level funding to help lay the groundwork for creation of a river basin water management authority in Souss-Massa.

FORWARD's five-year contract calls for a base 30-month Phase 1, with an external evaluation at month 24 to determine whether to extend the LOP for an optional 30-month period. That mid-term evaluation was carried out in mid-1998 and, based on the recommendation of the evaluation team, the contract was extended for the optional 30-month period. This is the second R4 for *FORWARD*, which has just passed the midway point in the five year life of the contract.

Factors Affecting Program Performance. *FORWARD* is faced with significant operational constraints, including very limited core funding, a sector which is hypersensitive politically, and the almost intractable nature of some of the problems it is asked to address.

Limited availability of core money has had a significant detrimental impact on the ability of the project to both vet and fully document its successes, to disseminate information on accomplishments and lessons learned, and to provide services to other countries in the ANE region. The country factor most influencing *FORWARD's* progress has been volatility in the urban water and wastewater sector in Egypt, and associated changes in USAID policy reform priorities there).

In spite of these constraints, however, *FORWARD* has performed far beyond initial expectations. Its two most significant achievements are (1) resolution of a few select water resource disputes of unusual sensitivity; and (2) the development of field demand for the project--based on performance--that is both broad and deep. Overall prospects for progress through FY 2001 are very good. Prospects for achieving each of the project's objectives over the rest of the LOP are also very good, although additional money for certain core functions will be critical to overall project success.

Exit Considerations. *FORWARD* was originally authorized as a six year project, with a completion date of October 2000. The contract is a five-year instrument, however, that runs through June 2001. Four factors--the 18-month delay in contracting, the limited cost of the project, project performance, and broad demand for its field-oriented services--will argue for extension of the project provided that project performance and relevance remain strong. Of special concern in this respect is the issue of post-project sustainability. The approaches developed by *FORWARD* are designed to be sustained via a cadre of well-trained dispute resolution practitioners in the countries in which the project has worked, a scenario that is threatened by the impact of limited core funding on results documentation and training.

2.0 PART II: RESULTS REVIEW

Summary of the SO. The results framework for *FORWARD* reflects that the project purpose is to use collaborative problem solving to settle water resource disputes in the ANE region: "*Collaborative problem solving approaches employed to settle domestic and transboundary water issues in the ANE region.*" The project has four intermediate results:

- **Host Country Commitment to Collaborative Problem Solving**
- **Enhanced Host Country Skills in Collaborative Problem Solving**
- **Broader Stakeholder Representation in Water Resource Management**
- **Collaborative Problem Solving Approaches Developed and Disseminated**

Clearly reflected in the new results framework is a focus on project *customers*--the USAID field missions and their host country governments.

The 1998 R4 Management Agreement. The 1998 R4 Review of *FORWARD* found "mixed performance" over the previous year due to three factors: (1) very limited availability of core money; (2) SO level indicators that were set at too high a level; and (3) factors significantly affecting implementation that were beyond the project's control. Pursuant to these findings, three major management agreements were established:

Reclassification as an SSO. *FORWARD* was reclassified as an ANE Strategic Support Objective (SSO), and it was agreed that "future *FORWARD* R4 reviews will be undertaken in conjunction with those of USAID/Mission SOs that it supports." This management decision was revisited in early CY 1999, however, and the decision was made to prepare the FY 2001 R4 for the project in Washington as it was in 1998.

Evaluation. It was agreed that an evaluation would be carried out to "recommend whether to execute the follow-on, 30-month *FORWARD* contract, based on performance and demand from Missions..." An internal evaluation carried out in mid-1998 recommended, based on project performance, that the Bureau implement Phase II of the project. This recommendation, one provision of which was "ANE Bureau agreement to fund the balance of Phase 1 (\$727,900) out of FY'99 funds prior to 31 December 1998," was implemented in CY 1998.

Revision of the Results Framework and Performance Data Table. It was also agreed that, based on the findings of the evaluation, the results framework and Performance Data Table for the project would be refined and submitted for Bureau approval. This agreement was fulfilled in mid-CY 1998, when a revised results framework (Fig. 1) and Performance Data Table were prepared and approved for the project.

Summary Performance Statement. *FORWARD's* performance is exceeding all expectations for the project, including those held at the time of project design, those held at the time of project startup, and those held at the time of the last R4. By the end of CY 1998, half of all indicators had surpassed their planned targets. These included one of three SSO indicators (which exceeded the planned level by 150%), and five of nine IR indicators which exceeded planned targets by from 20-73%. Another three indicators had fully met expectations, including the two other SSO indicators and one IR indicator. Of the remaining three indicators, one was postponed until 1999 for logistical reasons; the other two fell short of expectations, one because of Bureau funding.

SSO Indicators

No. of Agreements on Track:	<i>Exceeded</i>
No. of Agreements Reached:	Fully Met
No. of Institutions Using Method:	Fully Met

Intermediate Results Indicators

Funding from Host Countries/Missions:	<i>Exceeded</i>
Host Country Demand for Project Intervention:	<i>Exceeded</i>
Host Countries Dedicating In-kind Resources:	Shortfall
No. of Host Country Co-Mediator Nationals:	<i>Exceeded</i>
No. of Host Country Partners with Trained Staff:	<i>Exceeded</i>
No. of Stakeholders with Meaningful Participation:	<i>Exceeded</i>
Stakeholder Evaluation:	Postponed to 1999
Number of Disputes Addressed:	Fully Met
Number of Training Materials Prepared:	Shortfall

Performance and Prospects. Significant, meaningful changes in four intermediate results most accurately reflect project performance in the last year (Tables 1a-1d):

Number of Agreements On Track for Implementation. A key indicator of performance at the SSO level is the number of water dispute agreements on track for implementation through new contracts or commitments, new legislation, new policies or organizational changes. This is, in effect, where the rubber hits the road on *FORWARD*: Not just in brokering agreements on water disputes through collaborative problem solving, but in seeing those agreements effect real, on-the-ground change. We anticipated in February 1998 that two new agreements would be on track by the end of the year. Five agreements, however--three in Jordan, one in the Gaza Strip, and one on the West Bank--were being implemented by the end of CY 1998 (Table 1a).

Number of Agreements Reached. Agreements have to be reached before they can be implemented, and this is a second key indicator of *FORWARD* performance at the SSO level--the number of agreements reached. Expectations were fully met, with three agreements reached by the end of the calendar year (Table 1b). All were in Jordan, two involving the cost of water services and one involving water quality impacts.

Proportion of Project Funding Derived from the Field. One of the most illustrative indicators of "how the project is doing" is an intermediate results indicator that directly reflects field demand for *FORWARD* services: Significance and trend in the proportion of overall project funding obligations derived from the host countries and missions in which the project works. The planned proportion for CY 1998 was 50%, but the actual level was just below 70%--up from 58% at the end of CY 1997 (Table 1c).

Host Country Demand. Directly related to this is another IR indicator--the number of cases where host country governments sought the use of collaborative problem solving to address water conflicts. This indicator also exceeded expectations, with five cases anticipated in February 1998 and six cases actually occurring by the end of the calendar year (Table 1d). Of these, three were in Lebanon, one was in Jordan, one was in Morocco and one was in Egypt.

Mission Feedback. Another clear indicator of project performance, not reflected in the results framework, is feedback from US direct hire personnel in the missions where the project operates. All three missions with on-the-ground field operations responded very positively this year, in addition to one mission (Morocco) which submitted comments even though *FORWARD* had not yet initiated activities there.

Egypt. USAID/Egypt commented that *FORWARD*'s support to the Mission in "scoping out a managerial assessment of the Cairo General Organization for Sanitary Drainage, and fielding a superb team to carry it out, was instrumental in helping us towards an orderly close-out of nearly 20 years of involvement with the Cairo wastewater utility." Citing difficulties in the host country's ability to meet key sectoral policy reforms, USAID stated that it "needed a 'special touch' to carry out a final assessment of the organization. *FORWARD* was sensitive to these factors, and put together a SOW and a team well-suited for the job of finding all the skeletons and bringing them to light in a constructive way, as opposed to simply finding fault and pointing fingers. We plan to make good use of the assessment in taking our dialogue about sustainability of the Cairo wastewater system to the political level, as we bow off the stage of direct involvement in Cairo. *FORWARD*'s product will be our main tool in this process, and its high quality will greatly facilitate our efforts."

Jordan. USAID/Jordan focused on *FORWARD*'s work with the Water Authority of Jordan (WAJ) and the Jordan Valley Authority (JVA) to develop computer models which allow them to compare costs with revenues and develop appropriate strategies to pay for the provision of water, irrigation and sanitation services. The Mission noted that "the model can be easily manipulated to present a variety of scenarios which include a mix of cost reductions or revenue increases." As follow up, *FORWARD* is developing a new financial accounting system for JVA at Mission and GOJ request. "To ensure that the new system is fully accepted at all levels of the organization, facilitators/mediators will be included in the project team to help JVA communicate its vision of a more accountable organization run on sound business principles."

West Bank/Gaza. USAID/West Bank and Gaza reported that it has "been very pleased with *FORWARD*'s flexibility in responding to mission needs. The series of studies done by...*FORWARD* teams will provide the basis for the next phase of our water resources program in the West Bank. The teams confirmed some of our inclinations and pointed us in new/innovative directions in other cases...Likewise, they gave us an indication of what is feasible and--perhaps more importantly--what is not regarding reuse/recharge in the WB." In the Gaza Strip, the hydrologist hired through *FORWARD* "has allowed us to more effectively resolve internal and external issues relating to these issues." In short, "we simply would not have been able to move ahead with our water program as quickly/effectively without the specialized support we have received from *FORWARD* over the last year."

Morocco. USAID/Morocco submitted unsolicited comment on the project: "It may be too early for true testimonials about *FORWARD*'s work here. However, I can say that we have been extremely pleased up to now with our interaction with the *FORWARD* team...to set up the soon-to-start activity in the Souss-Massa River Basin. We have found *FORWARD* to be very collaborative and responsive to our needs, and, needless to say, very generous with regard to resource contributions. I cannot overemphasize how important the latter is to a small mission like Morocco. We look forward to working with the project over the next few months and perhaps for a longer period. I trust that this collaboration will be mutually beneficial, since I can't help but think that *FORWARD* will also gain from its association with our innovative program."

Possible Adjustments to Project Plans. The most significant adjustments to project plans last year were all attributable to lack of core funding. These included: (1) limiting the extent of our financial support to Lebanon and Morocco; (2) postponing any proactive groundwork for engagement on transboundary disputes; (3) postponing any approaches to new ANE Bureau missions; (4) postponing the evaluation of stakeholder groups; (5) postponing the development, testing and dissemination of training materials; (6) dropping peer review; and (7) cutting back outreach (seminars, newsletters and a website).

Other Donor Programs. Many donors are working in the water sector in the countries in which *FORWARD* operates. Because of the political sensitivity of the issues addressed by the project, however, and in some cases at specific Mission or host country request (e.g., Jordan), there has been no formal collaboration between the project and other donor field programs. *FORWARD* is nonetheless coordinating with ongoing World Bank water programs in Lebanon and Morocco.

Major Contractors and Grantees. *FORWARD* is implemented under a turnkey contract with Development Alternatives, Inc. (DAI), but it has a number of subcontractors that provide services to the project. Principal U.S. subcontractors used during the reporting period include the Conflict Management Group, HDR Engineering and the Training Resources Group (TRG). A range of subcontractors are also used in Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon and West Bank/Gaza.

3.0 PART III: RESOURCE REQUEST

Rationale for Program Resource Level. AID field missions pick up all costs that can reasonably be demanded--and negotiated--of them to cover the costs of the field activities which are the heart of *FORWARD*. Limited Bureau core funds are still required to meet operational costs, however, and to deliver on the basic provisions of the *FORWARD* contract with DAI. By this measure, *FORWARD* remains one of the most underfunded projects in the Bureau. During the first half of the LOP, for example, only 22% of the authorized core project funding level was made available to *FORWARD*. This situation has forced the project to cut back or to drop altogether a number of activities that were called for in the original design and are specified under the contract.

In response to more recent budget realities and a budgetary triage exercise carried out on *FORWARD* in December 1998 (Annex 3), last year's R4 request of \$1.1 million for FY'99 has now been scaled back to \$573,000 (Table 2a). That level will basically fund: (1) current management costs not billable to the missions through FY'99; (2) retention of either a project manager or significantly expanded short-term project management assistance; (3) initial field interventions in Lebanon and Morocco (consistent with the project's policy to pay for the initial intervention in a country to demonstrate what the project can do); and (4) limited transboundary water dispute resolution work in the Nile Basin and Middle East. This year's requests of \$1.5 million in FY'00 and \$1.5 million in FY'01 (Tables 2b and 2c) reflect funding levels necessary to fully implement the provisions of the project contract with DAI.

Performance-Influenced Resource Decisions. *FORWARD* has met or exceeded expectations on 75% of its results indicators, including all three indicators at the SO level. Based on performance *and* cost-efficiency, there is a strong rationale for provision of the limited level of core funding requested for *FORWARD*.

Relationship Between Program Request, OE and Staffing Requirements. The FY'99 program request for *FORWARD* in this R4 reflects funding that is essential for field operations, project management at DAI, and limited expansion into new countries. None of the target uses of funds relate to OE or AID staffing requirements.

Inconsistencies Between Pipeline Levels and Agency Forward Funding Guidelines. Since the funding that pays for *FORWARD* implementation through incremental funding of the contract is actually obligated in the field, pipeline analysis is inappropriate for this activity.

G Bureau Field Support. *FORWARD* has received no direct financial support from the Agency's Global Bureau, and does not anticipate requesting such assistance (Table 3).

4.0 PART IV: WORKFORCE AND OE

Workforce. Because *FORWARD* is implemented through a turnkey contract with DAI, the only OE-funded personnel involved in project implementation are (1) the AID/W-based USDH COTR and (2) USDH mission personnel responsible for overseeing *FORWARD* field operations in countries where the project works. Since all overseas OE-funded personnel are "accounted for" elsewhere, Table 4 reflects only the one half-time AID/W USDH COTR who manages the project.

Operating Expenses. As reflected in Table 5, *FORWARD* has not used and does not anticipate using OE or trust fund resources in FY'99, FY'00 or FY'01.

Trust Fund and FSN Voluntary Separation. *FORWARD* does not use local currency trust funds, nor does it involve deposits to or withdrawals from the any FSN voluntary separation account. Because of this, and the fact that *FORWARD* is a Washington-based ANE Bureau project, no trust fund/FSN voluntary separation table is included as part of this R4.

Controller Operations. *FORWARD* incurs no direct identifiable costs with the offices of the controllers at the field missions supported by the project. Because of this, and the fact that *FORWARD* is a Washington-based ANE Bureau project, no controller operations table is included with this R4.

SUPPLEMENTAL ANNEXES

Annex 1. Environmental Impact. *FORWARD* received a categorical exclusion at the time of project design (April 1994), and no unforeseen or previously unaddressed environmental impact issues have arisen since that time. In the event that any such issues do arise during implementation, an amended IEE will be prepared and cleared pursuant to 22 CFR 216.

Annex 2. Updated Results Framework. Pursuant to last year's R4 management agreement, *FORWARD* was redefined as an SSO and its results framework was revised to more realistically reflect results that are fully within the project's capacity to achieve. The current SSO and intermediate results (Fig. 1) are as follows:

SSO: *Collaborative problem solving approaches employed to settle domestic and transboundary water issues in the ANE region.*

IR1: *Host country government commitment to CPS established and maintained.*

IR2: *Host country knowledge and skills to apply problem solving methodologies enhanced.*

IR3: *Stakeholder representation in water resource management broadened.*

IR 4: *Collaborative problem solving approaches developed, tested, refined, and disseminated to interested parties.*

Annex 3. Threshold Analysis. *FORWARD's* threshold analysis is included under separate cover.

Table 1a

STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE: Collaborative Problem-Solving Approaches are Employed to Settle Domestic and Transboundary Water Issues in the ANE Region			
Indicator 1: <i>Number of agreements on track for implementation</i>			
Unit of Measure: agreements implemented through new donor or government contracts or commitments, new legislation, new policies adopted, or organizational changes Source: project reports, supported by mission information, legal codes, signed policy directives, letters of funding obligation, and organizational charts Comments: FORWARD's performance will be measured not only by the number of significant issues that are settled, but also by whether the agreements are carried out by the parties. Agreement implementation can take many forms, including laws enacted, policy changes, new programs funded, and offices created and institutionalized. The focus of the indicator is on the sustainability of the agreement reached by a diverse set of stakeholders. Checklist: For illustrative purposes, the following is checklist of anticipated efforts undertaken by the Water Authority of Jordan to implement agreement concerning the costing of urban water services for tariff restructuring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ a new department is created by the secretary-general of WAJ to house the water and wastewater models ▪ WAJ officers are formally appointed to staff the new department ▪ WAJ staff are trained in using and maintaining the models ▪ the models are integrated into WAJ's planning process for revenue generation and increased efficiency efforts ▪ block pricing for water in Greater Amman is restructured based on agreement over the costing of water services Targets: The FORWARD contract indicates that "for at least three significant water management problems, affected parties have...begun to implement integrated solutions." The project expects to exceed this level during its life. The number of targets is cumulative over the life of the project. Critical Assumption: Adequate donor and government resources will be available to implement any agreements reached.	Year	Planned	Actual
	1996-7 (B)	0	0
	1998	2	5
	1999	4	
	2000-1	6	

Table 1b

STRATEGIC SUPPORT OBJECTIVE: Collaborative Problem-Solving Approaches Are Employed to Settle Domestic and Transboundary Water Issues in the ANE Region			
Indicator 2: <i>Number of agreements reached</i>			
Unit of Measure: number of water issues	Year	Planned	Actual
(For FORWARD, a water issue is a longstanding, multiparty dispute with important implications for policy reform and/or program implementation for both the host country and USAID.)	1996-7 (B)	0	0
Source: written agreements, project reports, and mission activity summaries	1998	3	3
Comments: FORWARD is working closely with governments and authorities in the Near East on key domestic issues related to costing and charging for water services, decentralization and fiscal autonomy, privatization, water quality, land tenure and water rights, and groundwater management. Agreements over these issues, which result from collaborative problem-solving approaches, include revisions in government levels for water costs leading to a restructuring of tariffs, policy reforms at the most senior levels of government, and new program designs, among others. Agreements are anticipated with the Water Authority of Jordan and the Jordan Valley Authority on the costing of urban and irrigation water services for tariff restructuring and on the causes and implications of water quality in the Jordan Valley. Work continues with stakeholders in Egypt on reaching agreement over a policy reform agenda and in the West Bank on management of the Eastern Aquifer. A baseline of zero is considered appropriate.	1999	5	
	2000-1	8	
Checklist: As illustration, the following is a checklist of anticipated agreements between WAJ and JVA concerning the assessment of the impact of water quality variations in the Jordan Valley: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ initial scope of work as the framework for discussion ▪ set of most important water quality parameters ▪ adequacy and acceptability of existing laboratory and cropping/soil data ▪ projections of future water quality ▪ economic returns for farms and impact on export marketing ▪ technical options for mixing different water qualities ▪ practical ways to equitably account for water quality differences 			
Targets: The FORWARD contract indicates that “for at least three significant water management problems, affected parties have produced...integrated solutions.” The project expects to exceed this level during its life. The number of targets is cumulative over the life of the project.			
Critical Assumption: Sufficient political will exists and political stability persists to permit stakeholders to reach agreement in good faith.			

Table 1c

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1: Host country government commitment to collaborative problem-solving established and sustained			
Indicator 1.1: <i>The proportion of overall FORWARD funding obligations derived from host countries/missions is significant and increasing.</i>			
Unit of Measure: percentage of FORWARD incremental, versus core, funding Source: contract modifications and letters of implementation Comments: Although some core funding has been made available to FORWARD by the ANE Bureau, the project is expected to depend largely on incremental funding provided by USAID missions. This funding is accessible by virtue of formal host country requests or letters of implementation for and approval of allocations to FORWARD. An increasing proportion of the total funding being provided by missions should serve as a surrogate indication of the commitment of host country governments to the project approach, particularly in those cases where repeated funding is provided. Targets: An initial level of 50% or more moving to 75% or more in incremental funding seems reasonable and attainable, and exceeds the expectations of the project paper. Critical Assumption: Missions have adequate funding in their water portfolios to commit to FORWARD.	Year	Planned	Actual
	1996-7 (B)	35%	58%
	1998	>50%	69.7%
	1999	>60%	
	2000-1	>75%	

Table 1d

INTERMEDIATE RESULT 1: Host country government commitment to collaborative problem-solving established and sustained			
Indicator 1.2: <i>Number of cases using collaborative problem-solving sought by host country governments to address water conflicts</i>			
Unit of Measure: number of cases sought	Year	Planned	Actual
Source: formal letters from host country governments requesting project services, project reports, mission communication,	1996-7 (B)	3	6
Comments: FORWARD's approach is based on a close working relationship with host country governments and other key stakeholders in identifying critical water issues to address. The number of cases identified by governments, and their frequency and seriousness, suggests the degree to which governments believe that collaborative problem-solving approaches can be used to settle problems and make decisions with reasonable likelihood of success. Thus far, for 1996-97, the host countries have identified six cases for FORWARD: cost/tariff restructuring in Greater Amman, cost/tariff restructuring in the Jordan Valley, impact of water quality in the Jordan Valley, water and wastewater policy reform and decentralization in Egypt, and aquifer management in the West Bank.	1998	5	6
	1999	5	
	2000-1	5	
Targets: This indicator focuses on the number of cases identified by governments, but it does not necessarily imply all that all of these cases are "ripe" for mediation and that the project will, in fact, bring its technical resources to bear to address them. The number of targets presented here represent new cases identified each year.			
Critical Assumption: Host country governments will have opportunities to identify and request services and that core and mission funding are available to carry out initial program design and implementation.			

FY 1999 Budget Request by Program/Country

Program/Country: ANE Bureau FORWARD Project

(Enter either DA/CSD; ESF; NIS; or SEED)

07-Apr-99

07:42 AM

Approp Acct: DA

Scenario: Base Level

S.S. #1: Collaborative Problem Solving Approaches Used to Settle Water Issues in the ANE Region																
		FY 1999 Request														
	Bilateral/ Field Spt	Total	Micro- Enterprise	Agri- culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival (*)	Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Other Health	Environ	D/G	Est. S.O. Expendi- tures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of FY 99
SO 1: Collaborative Problem Solving Approaches Used to Settle Water Issues in the ANE Region.																
	Core Field	573 0 573											573			
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	573	0	0	0
SO 2:																
	Bilateral Field Spt	0 0 0														
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 3:																
	Bilateral Field Spt	0 0 0														
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 4:																
	Bilateral Field Spt	0 0 0														
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 5:																
	Bilateral Field Spt	0 0 0														
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 6:																
	Bilateral Field Spt	0 0 0														
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 7:																
	Bilateral Field Spt	0 0 0														
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SO 8:																
	Bilateral Field Spt	0 0 0														
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Bilateral		573	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	573	0	0	0
Total Field Support		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL PROGRAM		573	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	573	0	0	0

FY 99 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	573
Program ICASS	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 99 Account Distribution (DA only)	
Dev. Assist Program	573
Dev. Assist ICASS	
Dev. Assist Total:	573
CSD Program	0
CSD ICASS	
CSD Total:	0

Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account

Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.

For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account

FY 2000 Budget Request by Program/Country

Program/Country: ANE Bureau FORWARD Project

(Enter either DA/CSD; ESF; NIS; or SEED)

07-Apr-99

07:42 AM

Approp Acct: DA

Scenario: Base Level

S.S. #1: Collaborative Problem Solving Approaches Used to Settle Water Issues in the ANE Region																		
		FY 2000 Request													Est. S.O. Expendi- tures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of FY 00		
Bilateral/ Field Spt	Total	Micro- Enterprise	Agri- culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival (*)	Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Other Health	Environ	D/G					
SO 1: Collaborative Problem Solving Approaches Used to Settle Water Issues in the ANE Region.																	Year of Final Oblig:	
Core Field	1,500											1,500						
	0																	
	1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	0	0	0	0		
SO 2:																	Year of Final Oblig:	
Bilateral Field Spt	0																	
	0																	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SO 3:																	Year of Final Oblig:	
Bilateral Field Spt	0																	
	0																	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SO 4:																	Year of Final Oblig:	
Bilateral Field Spt	0																	
	0																	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SO 5:																	Year of Final Oblig:	
Bilateral Field Spt	0																	
	0																	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SO 6:																	Year of Final Oblig:	
Bilateral Field Spt	0																	
	0																	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SO 7:																	Year of Final Oblig:	
Bilateral Field Spt	0																	
	0																	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
SO 8:																	Year of Final Oblig:	
Bilateral Field Spt	0																	
	0																	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Total Bilateral		1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	0	0	0	0	
Total Field Support		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL PROGRAM		1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	0	0	0	0	

FY 00 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	1,500
Program ICASS	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 00 Account Distribution (DA only)	
Dev. Assist Program	1,500
Dev. Assist ICASS	
Dev. Assist Total:	1,500
CSD Program	0
CSD ICASS	
CSD Total:	0

Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account

Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.

For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account

FY 2001 Budget Request by Program/Country

Program/Country: ANE Bureau FORWARD Project

(Enter either DA/CSD; ESF; NIS; or SEED)

07-Apr-99

07:42 AM

Approp Acct: DA

Scenario: Base Level

S.S. #1: Collaborative Problem Solving Approaches Used to Settle Water Issues in the ANE Region																		
		FY 20001 Request													Est. S.O. Expendi- tures	Est. S.O. Pipeline End of FY 01	Future Cost (POST- 2001)	
	Bilateral/ Field Spt	Total	Micro- Enterprise	Agri- culture	Other Economic Growth	Children's Basic Education (*)	Other HCD	Population	Child Survival (*)	Infectious Diseases (*)	HIV/AIDS (*)	Other Health	Environ	D/G				
SO 1: Collaborative Problem Solving Approaches Used to Settle Water Issues in the ANE Region.																	Year of Final Oblig:	
	Core Field	1,500 0 1,500											1,500					
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	0	0	0	0	
SO 2:																	Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral Field Spt	0 0 0																
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SO 3:																	Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral Field Spt	0 0 0																
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SO 4:																	Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral Field Spt	0 0 0																
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SO 5:																	Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral Field Spt	0 0 0																
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SO 6:																	Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral Field Spt	0 0 0																
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SO 7:																	Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral Field Spt	0 0 0																
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
SO 8:																	Year of Final Oblig:	
	Bilateral Field Spt	0 0 0																
			0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Total Bilateral		1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	0	0	0	0	
Total Field Support		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
TOTAL PROGRAM		1,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,500	0	0	0	0	

FY 01 Request Agency Goal Totals	
Econ Growth	0
Democracy	0
HCD	0
PHN	0
Environment	1,500
Program ICASS	0
GCC (from all Goals)	0

FY 01 Account Distribution (DA only)	
Dev. Assist Program	1,500
Dev. Assist ICASS	
Dev. Assist Total:	1,500
CSD Program	0
CSD ICASS	
CSD Total:	0

Prepare one set of tables for each appropriation Account

Tables for DA and CSD may be combined on one table.

For the DA/CSD Table, columns marked with (*) will be funded from the CSD Account

Table 3

Accessing Global Bureau Services Through Field Support and Buy-Ins

Objective Name	Field Support and Buy-Ins: Activity Title & Number	Priority *	Duration	Estimated Funding (\$000)			
				FY 2000		FY 2001	
				Obligated by:		Obligated by:	
				Operating Unit	Global Bureau	Operating Unit	Global Bureau
SSO: Collaborative Problem Solving Approaches Used to Settle Water Issues in the ANE Bureau	None requested						
GRAND TOTAL.....							

* For Priorities use high, medium-high, medium, medium-low, low

le 4: Workforce Table*Org: AID/W/ANE (FORWARD Project)**End of year On-Board: 0.5*

FY 1999 Estimate	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SpO1	SpO2	Total SO/SpO	Org. Mgmt.	Fin. Mgmt	Admin. Mgmt	Con- tract	Legal	All Other	Total Mgmt.	Total Staff
OE Funded: 1/																
U.S. Direct Hire						0.5		0.5							0	0.5
Other U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire								0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5
Program Funded 1/																
U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSNs/TCNs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Direct Workforce	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows								0							0	0
IDIs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL WORKFORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5

Workforce Tables

	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SpO1	SpO2	Total SO/SpO	Org. Mgmt.	Fin. Mgmt	Admin. Mgmt	Con- tract	Legal	All Other	Total Mgmt.	Total Staff
FY 2000 Target																
OE Funded: 1/																
U.S. Direct Hire						0.5		0.5							0	0.5
Other U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire								0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5
Program Funded 1/																
U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSNs/TCNs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Direct Workforce	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows								0							0	0
IDIs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL WORKFORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5

FY 2000 Request																
OE Funded: 1/																
U.S. Direct Hire						0.5		0.5							0	0.5
Other U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire								0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5
Program Funded 1/																
U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSNs/TCNs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Direct Workforce	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows								0							0	0
IDIs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL WORKFORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5

Workforce Tables

Org: AID/W/ANE (FORWARD Project)								Total								
End of year On-Board: 0.5								SO/SpO	Org.	Fin.	Admin.	Con-	All	Total	Total	
FY 2001 Target	SO 1	SO 2	SO 3	SO 4	SO 5	SpO1	SpO2	Staff	Mgmt.	Mgmt	Mgmt	tract	Legal	Other	Mgmt.	Staff
OE Funded: 1/																
U.S. Direct Hire	0.5							0.5							0	0.5
Other U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire								0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5
Program Funded 1/																
U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSNs/TCNs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Direct Workforce	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows								0							0	0
IDIs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL WORKFORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5

FY 2001 Request																
OE Funded: 1/																
U.S. Direct Hire	0.5							0.5							0	0.5
Other U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSN/TCN Direct Hire								0							0	0
Other FSN/TCN								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5
Program Funded 1/																
U.S. Citizens								0							0	0
FSNs/TCNs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Direct Workforce	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5
TAACS								0							0	0
Fellows								0							0	0
IDIs								0							0	0
Subtotal	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL WORKFORCE	0	0	0	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.5

11.8	Special personal services payments	Do not enter data on this line.				
	IPA/Details-In/PASAs/RSSAs Salaries					
	Subtotal OC 11.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
12.1	Personnel Benefits					
	IPA/Details-In/PASAs/RSSAs Salaries					
	Subtotal OC 12.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
21.0	Travel and transportation of persons	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Training Travel					
	Operational Travel	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Site Visits - Headquarters Personnel					
	Site Visits - Mission Personnel					
	Conferences/Seminars/Meetings/Retreats					
	Assessment Travel					
	Impact Evaluation Travel					
	Disaster Travel (to respond to specific disasters)					
	Recruitment Travel					
	Other Operational Travel					
	Subtotal OC 21.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
23.3	Communications, Utilities, and Miscellaneous Charges	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Commercial Time Sharing					
	Subtotal OC 23.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
24.0	Printing & Reproduction	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Subscriptions & Publications					
	Subtotal OC 24.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.1	Advisory and assistance services	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Studies, Analyses, & Evaluations					
	Management & Professional Support Services					
	Engineering & Technical Services					
	Subtotal OC 25.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.2	Other services	Do not enter data on this line.				
	Non-Federal Audits					
	Grievances/Investigations					
	Manpower Contracts					
	Other Miscellaneous Services					
	Staff training contracts					
	Subtotal OC 25.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.3	Purchase of goods and services from Government accounts	Do not enter data on this line.				
	DCAA Audits					
	HHS Audits					
	All Other Federal Audits					
	Reimbursements to Other USAID Accounts					
	All Other Services from other Gov't. Agencies					
	Subtotal OC 25.3	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.7	Operation & Maintenance of Equipment & Storage					
	Subtotal OC 25.7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
25.8	Subsistence and support of persons (contract or Gov't.)					
	Subtotal OC 25.8	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
26.0	Supplies and Materials					
	Subtotal OC 26.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
31.0	Equipment					
	ADP Software Purchases					
	ADP Hardware Purchases					
	Subtotal OC 31.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
	TOTAL BUDGET	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0

FORWARD Results Framework

